

10/600,797

MS303968.01/MSFTP444US

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 13, 22, 29, 34, 42, and 43 have been amended to further emphasize various novel aspects and claims 7-10, 14, 16-18, 21, 24, and 39 have been amended herein to correct minor informalities as shown on pages 2-8 of the Reply. Additionally, claim 41 has been canceled herein. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Objection to Claim 16

Claim 16 stands objected to because of informalities. Claim 16 has been amended herein in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, and thus, this objection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claim 41 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. As claim 41 has been canceled, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 41 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As claim 41 has been canceled, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-43 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen *et al.* ("Using navigation data to improve IR functions in the context of Web search", Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management; Atlanta, Georgia, USA, ACM Press - 2001). It is respectfully

10/600,797

MS303968.01/MSFTP444US

requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Hansen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed subject matter relates to employing statistical filtering and ranking techniques to improve search engine results by tuning a general-purpose search engine based at least in part upon an entry point leading to the general-purpose search engine for a group of users. To this end, independent claim 1 (and similarly amended independent claims 13, 22, 29, 34, 42 and 43) recites a component that *identifies an entry point to the general-purpose search engine*; and a tuning component that *filters search query results of the general-purpose search engine based on criteria associated with the entry point*. Hansen *et al.* is silent regarding the above stated novel features of the subject claims.

More particularly, Hansen *et al.* fails to anticipate or suggest filtering search query results based on criteria associated with the entry point to the general-purpose search engine. The Office Action dated December 8, 2005 contends that the Hansen *et al.* discloses identifying an entry point to the general-purpose search engine and filtering search query results based on criteria associated with the entry point by equating the entry point to the general-purpose search engine as recited in the subject claims to a search session from Hansen *et al.* (*See* pg. 4) (“The preceding text excerpt clearly indicates that a point of reference/entry point (e.g. previous search sessions along with existing content hierarchies) exists within the search engine” and “search results from a search engine are improved/filtered based on criteria associated with the point of reference/entry point (e.g. search sessions).”). Applicant’s representative respectfully disagrees with such contentions.

10/600,797

MS303968.01/MSFTP444US

Hansen *et al.* relates to extracting search-related navigation information from proxy logs, and a mixture model which uses the search-related navigation data to perform clustering of queries to improve the display of search engine results by placing the target URL high in the displayed list. In particular, Hansen *et al.* notes that “[a] search session is the collection of words a user submits to a search engine (also known as a ‘query string’) together with the URLs of the Web pages they visit in response to their request.” (See pg. 135, col. 2). Thus, Hansen *et al.* relates to logging a query and selected results associated with the query. Further, Hansen *et al.* discloses “improving search results by first forming groups of queries based on the similarity of their associated search sessions.” (See pg. 137, col. 1). Accordingly, groups can be formed based on the similarity of query strings provided to a search engine and the similarity of URLs selected in response to the queries. A query or a selected result (*e.g.*, visited webpage), however, is not an entry point leading to a general-purpose search engine. Rather, the entry point to a general-purpose search engine can be a gateway that leads to the general-purpose search engine; upon reaching the general-purpose search engine through the entry point a search can be performed (*e.g.*, utilizing a query, ...), results can be filtered, *etc.* The subject claims relate to employing a consideration of the entry point to the general-purpose search engine. Thus, Hansen *et al.* fails to anticipate or suggest such claimed aspects.

Hence it can be concluded that the invention as described in independent claims 1, 13, 22, 29, 34, 42 and 43 is not anticipated or suggested by the cited reference. In view of at least the foregoing, this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 13, 22, 29, 34, 42, 43 and the claims that depend there-from should be withdrawn.

10/600,797

MS303968.01/MSFTP444US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP444US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731